



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,783	06/19/2000	Carl J. Kraenzel	LOT9-2000-0006 US1	3747

27085 7590 08/25/2003

IBM CORPORATION  
LOTUS SOFTWARE  
ONE ROGERS STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/596,783

Applicant(s)

KRAENZEL ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 29 May 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/24/2003 and the Amendment After Final filed on 05/29/2003 have been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-2, 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (US Patent 6,393,468), and in view of Sutter (US Patent 6,446,092).

4. McGee teaches independent claims 1, 6-7, 21 by the following:

“a database for storing user passwords” at Fig. 3, col. 7, lines 65-67;

“a plurality of subscriptions, each identified by a subscription user credential  
“including password, user name and authentic table electronic certificate” at  
Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 4-16;

“a service manager for executing concurrent replication of a plurality of said  
subscriptions on schedule or demand for which a password corresponding to  
said subscription credential has been provided by a user or found in said  
database” at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 16-37.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches  
“service manager replicating to a user browser an offline subscription containing  
client-side runtime framework for a fully functioning offline server.” Independent  
Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all  
application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same  
data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes  
made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10,  
lines 21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the  
user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus,

it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating databases periodically in the background.

5. As per independent claim 2, McGee teaches the following:

“a plurality of web-enabled, offline subscriptions each identified by user credentials including user identifier and subscription password” at Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 10-21;

“a utility responsive to user input for concurrently replicating on schedule or demand subscriptions for which said user has entered a user password matching said subscription password” at Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 40-49.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches “a service manager for displaying to a user a plurality of said subscriptions, for enabling user selection of replication parameters for each said subscription, for maintaining replication schedules for said subscriptions, and for replicating to a user browser an offline subscription containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server.” The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating databases periodically in the background.

6. As per dependent claim 4, Sutter teaches “plurality of web enabled, offline subscriptions are from multiple servers and from multiple user identities, and selectively

having separate database groupings and synchronization rules and properties” at Fig. 4 col. 16, lines 30-49.

7. As per dependent claim 5, McGee teaches by the following:

“a user password database for optionally storing said user password for each of said plurality of subscriptions” at Fig. 3 & 4, col. 10, lines 12-43;

“said utility being selectively responsive to a matching user password in said password database for replicating a corresponding subscription and responsive to no matching user password in said password database for prompting for user input of said user password before replicating said corresponding subscription” at Fig. 4 & 5, col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 12.

8. As per the independent claims 8, 14, 22, McGee teaches the following:

“a database of security domains” at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 38-48;

“system electronic certificates for authenticating user credentials” at Fig. 3 & 4, col. 10, lines 12-18;

“a tool responsive to said database and said certificates for distributing user identifiers selectively based upon security domain through auto generation, directory lookup or user prompt” at Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 56-67.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches “subscription containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server for offline operation of a client browser” at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 16-37. Independent Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all application transactions are against a local database. Sites

sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating databases periodically in the background.

9. As per dependent claims 9, 15, McGee teaches the following:  
“an identifier repository database” at Fig. 6, col. 12, lines 17-18;  
“a security domain document in said database of security domains for use in locating in said identifier repository database a user identifier selected for distribution based upon directory lookup” at Fig. 6, col. 12, lines 19-29.
10. As per dependent claims 10, 16, McGee teaches “a security domain document from said database of security domains for specifying an electronic certificate for use in auto generating a user identifier selected for distribution based upon auto generation” at Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 45-67.
11. As per dependent claims 11, 17, McGee teaches “prompt code for execution in response to a need for a user entered user identifier” at Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 14-18.
12. As per dependent claim 12, 18, McGee teaches “a security model for enabling the distribution of previously deployed user identifiers by table lookup” at Fig. 3-4 & 8, col. 12, lines 58-63.
13. As per dependent claims 13, 19, McGee teaches the following:

Art Unit: 2177

“prompt code for execution in response to a need for a user entered user identifier” at Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 14-18;

“a security model for enabling the distribution of previously deployed user identifiers by table lookup” at Fig. 3-4 & 8, col. 12, lines 58-63.

14. As per the independent claim 20, McGee teaches the following:

“providing a database of security domains” at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 38-48;

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches

“responsive to said database, distributing user identifiers for subscription containing client-side runtime framework for a fully functioning offline server for offline operation of a client browser selectively based upon security domain

through auto generation, directory lookup or user prompt” Independent

Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all

application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same

data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes

made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10,

lines 21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the

user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating databases periodically in the background.



15. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (US Patent 6,393,468), in view of Sutter (US Patent 6,446,092), and further in view of Forbes et al. (US Patent 6,381,742).

16. As per dependent claim 3, McGee and Sutter do not teach explicitly the disk space needed for the document on the internet. However, Forbes teaches "service manager further displaying disk space usage for enabling user limitation of usage or removal of said subscription" (at col. 12, line 29 to col. 14, line 3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include information on disk space needed to access an internet document in order to check the disk space on the client computer.

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant states as "There is no teaching in McGee of a 'subscription', as applicants have defined the term." Sutter, the new reference teaches the concept of subscription. Sutter teaches as Independent Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 21-33). The replication

engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64).

### ***Conclusion***

18. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


19. If a reference indicated, as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

  
Sathyanarayan Pannala  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2177

srp  
August 14, 2003

  
GRETA ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER